

[REDACTED]
TOP SECRET

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20505

DUPE

30 January 1968

MEMORANDUM FOR: [REDACTED]

SUBJECT:

CIA Comments on Project ARGO Drafts
of Executive Summary (Volume I) and
Volume II

1. Senior officials of the Agency have scanned the draft of the Executive Summary (Volume I) of the subject report and find no reason to submit comments other than to express their belief that this Summary will be most helpful for evaluating in proper context the results of Project ARGO.
2. Other appropriate officers have reviewed the draft of Volume II and are impressed by the detail and thoroughness of the investigations. The contribution made by the inclusion of Chapter X (A.I.D. Summary) is especially useful.
3. The assumption is explicitly stated or implied at several points in the draft material that acquisition of KH satellite photography is at no cost to user agencies. We suggest that such statements should be qualified to indicate that this photography was made available at no cost for the purpose of attaining the objectives of Project ARGO. The intelligence community is very conscious of the high costs involved in acquiring this photography.
4. The editors of the report are undoubtedly aware of certain inaccuracies and redundancies noticed in our review of the draft of Volume II. These are listed on the attached sheet.
5. In reviewing the subject Volumes, the Special Security Center noted that Dr. Hornig charged the members of Project ARGO with not only evaluating the satellite photography but also with developing a cadre of civilian agency personnel who can assist their agencies in planning for future systems and applications. The Special Security Center feels that it is entirely appropriate for the members to include

TOP SECRET
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

in their report certain elements of camera description data on which special security dissemination caveats have been previously imposed. These restrictions are:

"This publication is to be disseminated only on a 'must know' basis in keeping with the provisions of [REDACTED] (ARC-M-82) as indicated by the Special Handling Required control stamp. The use of this publication is limited to personnel who require the information for mensuration purposes."

The Special Security Center has no security objection to a more liberal interpretation of the dissemination caveat, which would allow the ARGO Report to be made available to individuals with T-KH clearances. However, it is emphasized that no extracts of camera performance information are to be made from the Report whether or not such extracts were intended for placement in the TALENT Control System. Therefore, we believe that it is necessary that all Volumes of the ARGO Report must carry the following caveat on their covers:

"This publication is to be disseminated only on a must-know basis in keeping with the provisions of [REDACTED] (ARC-M-82) as indicated by the Special Handling Required Control Stamp. The use of this publication is limited to authorized personnel who require the information for evaluation as an input to civilian agency planning and design of future systems. In view of their extreme sensitivity, camera characteristics and performance data shall not be extracted from this document."

Attachment

[REDACTED]
Acting Deputy Director for Intelligence

Orig: COMIREX Staff; [REDACTED] 2 Jan 68
Distribution:

Copy 1 & 2 Addressee
3 DDI
4 DDS&T
5 D/NPIC
6 IRS TOP SECRET
7 OS/ES/SSC
8-10 Ch/COMIREX

TOP SECRET

Attachment

Detailed CIA Comments on the Draft of Volume II

1. There is considerable duplication, from chapter to chapter, in technical descriptions of the various camera systems.
2. In the first full paragraph of I-5, the third sentence should reflect that the index camera was originally designed for vehicle attitude as well as for indexing.
3. On page I-6, the U-2 panoramic is incorrectly listed under the KH-4 system.
4. With reference to page II-A-21, the first sentence possibly could be misinterpreted as a formal recommendation to the managers of the KH-4 system. Rewording is suggested.
5. On page II-E-2, four lines from the bottom, there is either a typographical error or a misunderstanding when reference is made to a 200-day orbital lifetime.

TOP SECRET